



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,369	12/20/2001	David L. Henty	DLHLPAU.03	9652
7590 David L. Henty Suite 1150 19900 MacArthur Blvd. Irvine, CA 92612		09/05/2008	EXAMINER KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/05/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/027,369

Applicant(s)

HENTY, DAVID L.

Examiner

SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-14 and 16-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-6, 8-14, 16-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The following office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed on August 5, 2008. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-24 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 19 and 20 have been amended. Claims 7 and 15 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1-4, 6, 8-14, 16-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsien (US 6,441,804) in view of Klein (US 6,259,367).

As to independent claim 1, Hsien discloses a wireless mouse (col. 2, lines 65, Fig. 1, item 24, wireless cursor pointing device, shown to be a wireless mouse in col. 3, lines 5-8) and reader combination (Fig. 1, item 34, col. 3, lines 1-4), comprising: a source of an interrogating field (Fig. 1, the distance between 24 and 34); a wireless mouse having a mouse motion encoder (col. 3, lines 12-24, shown by the x-axis (40) and y-axis (44) position generators, for generating positions of the mouse), an antenna (90), and an RF circuit (transmitter circuit 28 with an RF amplifier (82)) coupled to the antenna (col. 3, lines 44-61) and associated with the motion encoder and providing a RF signal identifying mouse motion (col. 3, lines 44-61); and a reader (34) including a decoder (164, demodulation circuit) for receiving RF signals from the wireless mouse (col. 7, lines 27-55) and detecting the data sent from the RF tag passive transponder circuit (col. 7, lines 27-55) and the mouse motion information from the mouse RF circuit (col. 7,

lines 15-20, where the reader receives signals from the transmitter in the wireless mouse about motion).

Hsien does not disclose wherein the wireless mouse and reader combination is adapted for use with a separate independently movable RFID tag, the tag having data stored therein and a passive transponder circuit, and wherein the reader receives RF signals from the separate and independently movable RFID tag.

Klein teaches an electronic computer system comprising a reader for use with a separately independently movable RFID tag (col. 2, lines 51-60). The RFID tag has data stored therein and a passive transponder circuit (col. 2, line 61-col. 3, line 7), and wherein the reader receives RF signals from the separate and independently movable RFID tag (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the RFID tagged products to be read as shown by Klein into the system of Hsien as the RFID tagging facilitates locating and/or retrieving of objects by radio frequency (Klein col. 3, lines 44-49).

Hsien and Klein do not explicitly teach wherein said reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and wireless mouse. However as the KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc teaches, the elements of a reader with an antenna, an RFID tag and a wireless mouse, in combination did no more than they would in separate, sequential operation; see MPEP 2141. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and the wireless mouse, as a shared antenna prevents redundancy and reduces the number of components.

As to independent claim 10, Hsien discloses a wireless keyboard (col. 2, lines 65, Fig. 1, item 24, wireless cursor pointing device, shown to be a wireless keyboard in col. 3, lines 5-8) and reader combination (Fig. 1, item 34, col. 3, lines 1-4), comprising: a source of an interrogating field (Fig. 1, the distance between 24 and 34); a wireless keyboard having a plurality of keys, an antenna(90), and an RF circuit (transmitter circuit 28 with an RF amplifier (82)) coupled to the antenna (col. 3, lines 44-61) and providing a RF signal identifying key activation (col. 3, lines 44-61) ; and a reader (34) including a decoder (164, demodulation circuit) for receiving RF signals from the wireless keyboard (col. 7, lines 27-55) and detecting the data sent from the RF tag passive transponder circuit (col. 7, lines 27-55) and the key activation information from the keyboard RF circuit (col. 7, lines 15-20, where the reader receives signals from the transmitter in the wireless keyboard activation); although the embodiment is shown to be a wireless cursor pointing device with the example of a wireless mouse, Hsien discloses in col. 3, lines 5-8 where it is well known in the art to use a wireless keyboard with the same system and would be the same type of signals transmitted and received.

Hsien does not disclose wherein the wireless mouse and reader combination is adapted for use with a separate independently movable RFID tag, the tag having data stored therein and a passive transponder circuit, and wherein the reader receives RF signals from the separate and independently movable RFID tag.

Klein teaches an electronic computer system comprising a reader for use with a separately independently movable RFID tag (col. 2, lines 51-60). The RFID tag has data stored therein and a passive transponder circuit (col. 2, line 61-col. 3, line 7), and wherein the reader

receives RF signals from the separate and independently movable RFID tag (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the RFID tagged products to be read as shown by Klein into the system of Hsien as the RFID tagging facilitates locating and/or retrieving of objects by radio frequency (Klein col. 3, lines 44-49).

Hsien and Klein do not explicitly teach wherein said reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and wireless mouse. However as the KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc teaches, the elements of a reader with an antenna, an RFID tag and a wireless mouse, in combination did no more than they would in separate, sequential operation; see MPEP 2141. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and the wireless mouse, as a shared antenna prevents redundancy and reduces the number of components.

As to dependent claims 2 and 11, limitations of claims 1 and 10, further comprising, Klein teaches wherein said RFID tag is attached to a product and wherein the data stored in said RFID tag comprises product related information (col. 4, lines 19-26).

As to dependent claims 3 and 12, limitations of claims 1 and 10, further comprising, Klein teaches wherein said RFID tag is attached to a smart card and wherein the data stored in said RFID tag comprises financial information (col. 1, lines 60-67 and col. 6, lines 59-65)

As to dependent claims 4 and 13, limitations of claims 1 and 10, further comprising, Klein teaches wherein the data stored in said RFID tag comprises internet address location information (col. 3, lines 3-11).

As to dependent claim 6, limitations of claim 1, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said reader detects first and second RF frequencies (col. 7, lines 15-55, multiple RF frequencies can be detected) and wherein said RFID tag transponder circuit and mouse RF circuit are operative at said first and second frequencies (col. 7, lines 15-55), respectively.

As to dependent claims 8 and 16, limitations of claims 7 and 10, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said source of an interrogating field comprises said reader antenna (150, col. 7, lines 15-20).

As to dependent claim 9, limitations of claim 1, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said mouse RF circuit comprises one or more passive transponder circuits responsive to said interrogating field (col. 7, lines 15-55).

As to dependent claim 14, limitations of claim 10, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said reader detects first and second RF frequencies (col. 7, lines 15-55, multiple RF frequencies can be detected) and wherein said RFID tag transponder circuit and said keyboard RF circuit are operative at said first and second frequencies (col. 7, lines 15-55, multiple RF frequencies can be detected), respectively.

As to dependent claim 17, limitations of claim 10, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said keyboard RF circuit comprises one or more passive transponder circuits responsive to said interrogating field (col. 7, lines 15-55).

As to dependent claim 18, limitations of claim 10, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said reader detects the data sent from the RFID tag passive transponder circuit and the key activation information from the keyboard RF circuit, during first and second time slots (col. 7, lines 15-55, multiple RF frequencies can be detected), respectively.

As to independent claim 19, limitations of claims 1 and 10, and further comprising, Hsien teaches a computer system (Fig. 1, item 10) comprising; a processor (personal computer, item 18, a processor while not explicitly stated, is inherent to a computer). Hsien fails to teach where the computer system comprises a monitor. Klein teaches a computer system (Fig. 32), comprising a monitor for displaying information (col. 3, lines 7-10, wherein a web browser is launched on a monitor). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the monitor as taught by Klein into the computer system of Hsien as the monitor enables users to view information (Klein, col. 3, lines 7-10).

Hsien and Klein do not explicitly teach wherein said reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and wireless mouse. However as the KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc teaches, the elements of a reader with an antenna, an RFID tag and a wireless mouse, in combination did no more than they would in separate, sequential operation; see MPEP 2141. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and the wireless mouse, as a shared antenna prevents redundancy and reduces the number of components.

As to independent claim 20, is a method claim of claims 1 and 10, thus is rejected in the same manner.

As to dependent claim 21, limitations of claim 19, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein the wireless manual input device is a keyboard or a mouse (col. 3, lines 5-8); Klein teaches wherein the RFID tag contains security data for access to the computer system (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7, col. 6, lines 59-65).

As to dependent claim 22, limitations of claim 20, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein the wireless manual input device is a keyboard or mouse (col. 3, lines 5-8); Klein teaches wherein the reader is configured in the computer system (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7).

As to dependent claim 23, limitations of claim 22, further comprising, Klein teaches wherein the RFID tag contains security data for access to the computer system (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7, col. 6, lines 59-65).

As to dependent claim 24, limitations of claim 20, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein the second RF field is a second modulated return field (col. 7, lines 15-55).

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsien in view of Klein as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Liu et al (6,445,379).

As to dependent claim 5, limitations of claim 1, further comprising, Hsien as modified by Klein do not wherein said motion encoder comprises a ball adapted to rotate in response to mouse motion and X and Y encoder wheels coupled to the ball so as to respectively rotate in response to mouse motion in perpendicular directions and wherein said XY encoder wheels further comprise a circuit element coupled to said RF circuit so as to tune and detune said RF circuit in response to mouse motion in X and Y directions

Liu et al teach a wireless mouse wherein said motion encoder comprises a ball (Fig. 1, item 23, col. 2, lines 32-37) adapted to rotate in response to mouse motion (col. 2, lines 32-37) and X and Y encoder wheels (Fig. 1, shown by wheels, one in the x-axis and one in the y-axis) coupled to the ball so as to respectively rotate in response to mouse motion in perpendicular directions (Fig. 1) and wherein said XY encoder wheels further comprise a circuit element coupled to said RF circuit so as to tune and detune said RF circuit in response to mouse motion

in X and Y directions (col. 2, lines 32-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the inner workings of the wireless mouse as shown by Liu et al into the system of Hsien as modified by Klein, as the system of Hsien as modified by Klein teach a wireless mouse but does not disclose the internal circuitry. The wireless mouse of Liu et al is advantageous as it is practical and has a low malfunction rate is lightweight as disclosed by Liu et al in col. 1, lines 7-12).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed August 5, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues where Hsien and Klein do not employ a shared antenna since a capacitively couple system such as Klein could simply not employ an RF antenna such as Hsien. Examiner, respectfully disagrees. With reference to MPEP 2141, KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc, the elements of the wireless mouse, RFID tag and reader in combination did no more than they would in separate, sequential operation. Further, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the reader would employ a shared antenna to avoid redundancy and to reduce the number of components within the system. application. Therefore, the rejection is maintained and made FINAL.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR whose telephone number is (571)272-7769. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Lefkowitz can be reached on 571 272 3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Srilakshmi K Kumar/
Examiner
Art Unit 2629

SKK
September 2, 2008